

## REMARKS

Applicants have amended claim 1 to overcome the indefiniteness rejection and added new claim 21, which finds support, for example, at page 4, lines 8-9, of the specification.

Applicants have amended the specification to correct inadvertent mistakes that they found upon a review of the specification.

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating allowable subject matter.

Claims 1, 4, 5 and 7 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0051836 (Jung). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

This application claims priority from Japanese Patent Application No. 2002/326413, filed November 11, 2002. Since the filing date of the priority Japanese application is before the filing date of Jung, September 11, 2003, Jung is not prior art. Applicants submit a sworn translation of the Japanese priority application with this amendment. Thus, the rejection of claims 1, 4, 5 and 7 under 35 USC 102(e) on Jung should be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 4, 5 and 7 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,774,398 (Jang). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites a vertical driving circuit supplying a gate scanning signal to the gate lines and states that at least one of the gate lines comprises a first gate line and a second gate line, and a metal wiring connects the first and second gate lines and is located near an output portion of the vertical driving circuit. The Examiner equates Jang's gate TFT B to the claimed vertical driving circuit, gate line 2 to the claimed first gate line, drain electrode 302 to the claimed second gate line and second connecting portion 102 to the claimed metal wiring connecting the first and second gate lines. Applicants respectfully disagree.

First, Jang's second connecting portion 102 is not a metal wiring as claimed. Rather, it is made of an oxide compound, such as ITO or IZO. See, for example, at column 10, lines 56-59, of Jang. Second, Jang's drain electrode 302, which the Examiner equates to the claimed second gate line, is part of Jang's gate TFT B, which the Examiner equates to the claimed vertical

driving circuit. Thus, Jang's TFT B cannot supply the gate scanning signals to the second gate line as claimed because the drain electrode, which the Examiner equates to the claimed second gate line, is a device element of the TFT B that supplies the gate scanning signals. Third, Jang's TFT B cannot and does not supply the gate scanning signals to the gate lines as claimed because "TFTs A and B are always in an off state which is the same as a disconnection state." See, column 6, lines 14-15, of Jang.

The rejection of claims 1, 4, 5 and 7 under 35 USC 102(e) on Jang should be withdrawn because Jang does not teach or suggest the claimed display device.

The remaining rejection relies on Jang and thus should be withdrawn as well because Jang does not provide the teachings for which it is cited.

In light of the above, a Notice of Allowance is solicited.

In the event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952**, referencing Docket No. **492322014800**.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 7, 2005

By:   
Barry E. Bretschneider *31,942*  
Registration No. 28,055

Morrison & Foerster LLP  
1650 Tysons Boulevard, Suite 300  
McLean, VA 22102-3915  
Telephone: (703) 760-7743  
Facsimile: (703) 760-7777